4th November 1935]

Co-operation

Instruction of panchayatdars and supervisors of co-operative societies in the knowledge of co-operation.

* 427 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there are any proposals for spreading knowledge of co-operation by holding classes for instruction to the panchayatdars and supervisors of co-operative societies in each district or in selected districts;

(*b*) if so, what they are;

(*c*) how much the Government propose to spend on this scheme; and

(*d*) whether any grant is got or anticipated from the Government of India for the purpose and, if so, how much, and how long it is likely to continue?

A.—A scheme for the improved training of supervisors and panchayatdars has been received from the Registrar of Co-operative Societies in connexion with a general scheme of co-operative training and education proposed to be given to the staff of the department and of non-official institutions and to panchayatdars and members of co-operative societies, with the aid of a grant from the Government of India. The whole scheme is under the consideration of Government. It is not yet possible to furnish the other particulars asked for.

Mr. G. R. Premayya:—"The question asks whether any grant is anticipated from the Government of India and if so, how much; I don't find any answer to that in the answer on the paper; it simply says that a scheme has been received from the Registrar for the improved training of supervisors, etc., with the aid of a grant from the Government of India. It does not say how much grant has been given?"

The Hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"The Government of India propose to give us a grant of Rs. 3,59,000."

Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai:—"Is the scheme to be tried throughout the Presidency or in selected places? Are they going to have centres of training in different places, or only in one or two districts?"

The Hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"The whole scheme is under consideration. At this stage I cannot say whether it is going to be limited to a few centres or spread out throughout the province."

Local Self-Government

Replies of presidents of district boards in regard to delegation of powers to the secretaries of district boards.

* 428 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) what reply each of the presidents of district boards gave for the communication sent to them by the Government in the matter of delegating some of the powers to the secretaries of district boards; and

[4th November 1935

(b) whether copies of them will be placed on the table?

A.—The correspondence is confidential.

Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder:—"May I ask, Sir, whether the correspondence is confidential only at this stage, or it is confidential all through?"

The Hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—"The Government consider that such correspondence should always be treated as confidential."

Mr. G. R. Premayya:—"Why should there be any confidential correspondence? Local self-governing bodies are democratic bodies?"

The Hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—"This correspondence is confidential because it contains the personal views of the presidents of district boards."

Irrigation

Damage to the Raja Vaikal channel since the construction of the Mettur dam.

* 429 Q.—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Raja Vaikal channel branching from Jadarpalayam in Namakkal taluk of Salem district has been a perennial one ever since it was constructed, unlike Kalingarayan channel in Erode taluk or any other channel;

(b) whether the Government have taken any expert opinion whether the flow in the Cauvery channel regulated by Korambu system in Namakkal taluk is increased or continued for longer period than before;

(c) if so, whether a copy of such opinion obtained will be placed on the table;

(d) how often since the construction of the Mettur dam the Korambu has given way and how many days the water dried up in the channel; and

(e) on what basis or on what statistics the Government issued G.O. No. 736, Revenue, dated 12th April 1934?

A.—(a) The Government are not aware that the facts are as suggested.

(b) & (c) The Engineers of the Government reported that the Cauvery-Mettur Project would assure a steadier and better supply to the channel than it was receiving prior to the construction of the Project when it was wholly dependent on rainfall and the condition of the river. The Government do not consider it necessary to place the reports on the table of the House.

(d) The Government have no information.